

REMARKS

This amendment is submitted in reply to the Office Action dated March 6, 2006. Claims 1-18 currently stand rejected. New claims 19-21 have been added to further define patentable aspects of the invention. No new matter has been added by the amendment.

In light of the amendments and the remarks presented below, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all now-pending claims of the present application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

Claims 10-14, 17 and 18 currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Smith et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,891,811, hereinafter "Smith"). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Independent claim 10 recites, *inter alia*, receiving an SVMS message in packet-data format and storing the SVMS message in a data storage device in communication with the SVMS server.

Smith is directed to a short message service center (SMSC) mobile-originated to HTTP internet communication system which allows short message communications between wireless devices and application servers on the internet (col. 2, lines 42-44). In this regard, the background section of Smith discloses a conventional Voice Mail System (VMS 508) which is in communication with the SMSC (col. 2, lines 18-67). However, the VMS of Smith, which may deliver short messages to the SMSC, is not disclosed as being capable of converting such short messages into a packet-data format as claimed in independent claim 10. Furthermore, Smith fails to teach or suggest that the short messages are stored in the packet-data format. Moreover, one skilled in the art would appreciate that the short message of Smith simply indicates the existence of a voice message which the user can call in to retrieve. In fact, Smith never suggests that the short messages contain any audio or voice data, much less voice data in packet-data format. Thus, even if it were assumed that Smith disclosed a system capable of packet-data communication, Smith still fails to teach or suggest that the system converts short voice messages to packet data format for subsequent communication. Thus, Smith fails to teach or

suggest receiving an SVMS message in packet-data format and storing the SVMS message in a data storage device in communication with the SVMS server as claimed in independent claim 10.

Claims 11-14, 17 and 18 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 10 and thus include all the recitations of independent claim 10. Therefore, dependent claims 11-14, 17 and 18 are patentable for at least those reasons given above for independent claim 10.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of claims 10-14, 17 and 18 are overcome.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

Claims 1, 4-6, 8 and 9 currently stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Thompson et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0059388, hereinafter "Thompson") and Smith. Claims 2, 3 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Thompson and Smith in view of Logan (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0153729). Claims 15 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith in view of Baral et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,932,042, hereinafter "Baral").

As stated above, Smith fails to teach or suggest receiving an SVMS message in packet-data format and storing the SVMS message in a data storage device in communication with the SVMS server as claimed in independent claim 10. Baral fails to cure the deficiencies of Smith in this regard and is not cited as such. Since neither Smith nor Baral teach or suggest receiving an SVMS message in packet-data format and storing the SVMS message in a data storage device in communication with the SVMS server as claimed in independent claim 10, any combination of Smith and Baral likewise fails to teach or suggest the above recited feature. Thus, independent claim 10 is patentable over the combination of Smith and Baral. Claims 15 and 16 depend indirectly from independent claim 10 and thus include all the recitations of independent claim 10. Therefore, dependent claims 15 and 16 are patentable for at least those reasons given above for independent claim 10.

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a packet-data generator for converting an SVMS message into a packet-data format, and a storage device for electronically storing the SVMS message.

As stated above, Smith fails to teach or suggest converting an SVMS message into a packet-data format and electronically storing the SVMS message which is in the packet-data format. Meanwhile, Thompson is directed to a communications service provider for providing wireless access to a packetized data network. In this regard, Thompson discloses an interface (206) for transforming or translating from proprietary or specialized email communication formats and protocols of a wireless ASP server computer (16) to standardized formats and protocols of an email application (202) (paragraph [0044], lines 8-12). However, Thompson fails to disclose any translation or transformation of voice messages. To the contrary, the claimed invention provides conversion of SVMS messages into packet-data format and storage of such messages. There is no disclosure in all of Thompson, in general, or the cited passages, in particular, of a packet-data generator for converting an SVMS message into a packet-data format, and a storage device for electronically storing the SVMS message as claimed in independent claim 1.

Logan similarly fails to teach or suggest a packet-data generator for converting an SVMS message into a packet-data format, and a storage device for electronically storing the SVMS message as claimed in independent claim 1, and is not cited as such.

Since none of the cited references alone teach or suggest a packet-data generator for converting an SVMS message into a packet-data format, and a storage device for electronically storing the SVMS message as claimed in independent claim 1, any combination of the cited references likewise fails to render independent claim 1 obvious for at least the same reasons described above. Claims 2-9 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 1, and thus include all the recitations of independent claim 1. Therefore, dependent claims 2-9 are patentable for at least those reasons given above for independent claim 1.

Accordingly, for all the reasons given above, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections of claims 1-9, 15 and 16 are overcome.

Appl. No.: 09/967,070
Amdt. dated 06/06/2006
Reply to Official Action of March 6, 2006

Newly Added Claims

Applicant has added new claims 19-21 to more particularly define aspects of the present application. The new claims include no new matter and are fully supported by the specification and the drawings of the present application.

Accordingly, it is believed that the new claims are in condition for allowance.

Appl. No.: 09/967,070
Amdt. dated 06/06/2006
Reply to Official Action of March 6, 2006

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and the remarks presented above, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims of the present application are in condition for allowance. It is respectfully requested that a Notice of Allowance be issued in due course. The Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney to resolve any remaining issues in order to expedite examination of the present application.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.

Respectfully submitted,



Chad L. Thorson
Registration No. 55,675

Customer No. 00826
ALSTON & BIRD LLP
Bank of America Plaza
101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000
Tel Charlotte Office (704) 444-1000
Fax Charlotte Office (704) 444-1111

ELECTRONICALLY FILED USING THE EFS-WEB ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES
PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE ON June 6, 2006.